



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/691,822	08/05/96	LEE	H 224955/P3334

B5M1/0114

EXAMINER

CUNNINGHAM, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2504

DATE MAILED:

01/14/97

CUSHMAN DARBY AND CUSHMAN  
NINTH FLOOR EAST TOWER  
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20005-3918

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No. <b>08/691,822</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Lee</b>
	Examiner <b>Terry D. Cunningham</b>	Group Art Unit <b>2504</b>

**THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]**

- a)  expires three months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on \_\_\_\_\_ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

**Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Dec 30, 1996 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:**

- The proposed amendment(s):

- will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
- will not be entered because:
  - they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
  - they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
  - they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
  - they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

**NOTE:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):  
\_\_\_\_\_

- Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

- The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The mere fact that memory circuits have these inherent modes, this still does not cause the claim to be definite.

Clearly, the memory cell is recited by way of environment and there is no "means" recited to provide these modes.

- The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

- For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: 2 and 3

Claims objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims rejected: 1, 4, 5, 7, and 8

- The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_  has  has not been approved by the Examiner.

- Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

- Other The IDS submitted 12/30/96 has not been considered because such is not in compliance with 37 C.F.R 1.97. The IDS does not include the Certification, petition and fee required, a copy of the references and the concise English explanation of non-english references.

*Terry D. Cunningham*  
**TERRY D. CUNNINGHAM**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**ART UNIT 2504**